



City of Tempe

NOTES FROM THE CASE STUDIES MEETINGS

6:00 pm, September 19, 2002
Priest Yard Assembly Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Mare Schumacher, NAC
Bill Regner, Former DR
Tom Bourdo, BOA
Kirby Spittler, PZ
Dr. Miranda Carlton-Carew
Darin Sender, CAC
Scot Siegel, Otak
Fred Brittingham, Planning
Steve Venker, Planning
Grace Kelly, Planning

Chris Aulerich, CAC
Darlene Justus, Neighborhoods
Mike Crusa, PZ
Ron Collett, PZ
Margaret Stout
Atis Krigers, BOA
Roger Millar, Otak

Mary O'Connor, Transit
Bonnie Richardson, CD+D

INTRODUCTION – Overview

- Concern over multiple overlays.
- Concern over increased density in multi-family zoning districts.
- Concern over Pedestrian Overlay radius of 1500 feet from arterial/arterial and arterial/collector intersections. 500' is better.

CHECKER SITE: PRESENTATION OF THREE SCENARIOS

- Would like to see windows required at street front in base zoning.
- Concern over on-street parking on University Drive.
- Businesses would go out of business once you shut off access and don't grant a curb cut onto University. No chance for impulse buying if you have no convenient access.
- Suggestion, zoning hearings be separate from hearings for variances or should not include variances.

9th & WILSON SITE: PRESENTATION OF THREE SCENARIOS

- In Pedestrian Overlay District, in Multi-family zoning, density bonus was taken out. What about height bonus?
- Did we eliminate the standard that says you can't park in the first 25' of the front yard?
- Can a developer do plan 2 (7 units/7lots) in the Pedestrian Overlay district? No because requirements for Pedestrian Oriented design require a certain percentage of building on street front, garages 20' back, etc.

ALPHA BETA SITE: PRESENTATION OF THREE SCENARIOS

- IN MU-3, do you have to do residential on top of commercial building? No. Can do it side by side.

COMMENTS:

- I like that the process is streamlined. Less variances. You're headed in the right direction.
- Remove all density/height bonuses (44') for multi family zones. Is parking allowed in front yard setback for multi family??? I love the stepback in heights. I fully support the Ped Overlay District, but NOT the provisions for: 1) area applying to single family, 2) 1500 feet radius on the transit connections – reduce to 500 feet, and 3) height bonuses with out residential on commercial or “mixed use” in the transit connects and balance of district.
- Consider dropping parking requirements from Zoning ordinance design standards. Let “respective industries” come forward with their respective standards. That way, we can focus on site design, landscaping access, building footprint, and landscaping, and get better designed sites and buildings. Consider districts combining residential with non-residential, allowing second and third floors to be built over parking areas. This would create amenities, shade for parking decks, patio space around units, and add visual character to sites. Example would be Hayden Square condos on a modified format.
- I am still looking to see how the new ordinance addresses issues of sustainability. How are issues of clean air and water, energy conservation, heat island and resource depletion addressed? In R-3 case study (9th and Wilson site) reference is made to the desirability of short street frontages and rhythm on the street. Ordinance should include standards for maintaining the “lot size patterns” in certain contexts. The tool to achieve this standard ought to be public hearing requirements for plats.
- Pedestrian Overlay District – Use Caution regarding deleting ingress/egress on to main arterials, as well as adding medians near intersections. Potentially, a business on the south side of the street, for example will only benefit from auto traffic eastbound. There is a high potential for business failure.
- (1.) I would like to see businesses pay for sidewalk improvements and other parts of Ped Overlay District. They will benefit financially from Ped Overlay District, so it is more than fair. (2.) I really like the first level retail/restaurant with second level living along University. Scale is important here - - no more than two or three level. (3.) I am concerned about density “bonuses” – why are we giving these? I would like to see density increase sparingly (e.g. previous example on University and along arterials- not in neighborhoods. (4.) Process – I ‘m very concerned that comments from public meetings (after this) will not be incorporated into plans—it will just be added as comments. I think it will save you a lot of time, money and hassle if you incorporate public comments NOW. And don't say “we've already gotten public input”. Meetings among commissioners is not the same and our neighborhoods know this. Please bring this back to the people and incorporate our wishes. Even if you had public meetings before, things are more concrete now – time to ask again. (5.) Joining lots makes me nervous –seems like recipe for big, junky developments. (6.) Love landscaping. The more it's required, the better. (7.) Commercial examples are too lenient –looks like we could get some monstrosity.
- (1.) Good idea to eliminate bonus for density increase in Multi family Pedestrian Overlay District. (2.) Public breakdown of historic variance categories/quantities versus – breakdown of variances applying new code -- improvements? (3.) Flow charts for process – review approval appeal, neighborhood meetings, etc. would be very helpful. (4.) Overlay districts and versus multiple overlay districts. Needs to be clearly documented in zoning code. (5.) Support scaling back 1500-ft. zone around arterial / arterial and arterial/collector intersections, to reduce impact on neighborhoods (6.) Accessory Dwellings – Page 2-6 Table 2-202 Not permitted in single family residential , page 2-5 Section 2-201b1 Single family residential category includes agriculture therefore accessory dwellings not permitted in AG. Conflict on Page 2-15 Section 2-203 2.c. On a lot zoned AG, the accessory dwelling shall not be

closer, etc. By this code, AG cannot have accessory dwellings! I think accessory dwellings should be allowed in AG districts. – Shouldn't page 2-5 and table 2-202 be adjusted? Accessory dwellings should not be allowed in single family districts.